## Premera Blue Cross Public Meeting

		Page 1
1	WASHINGTON STATE INSURANCE COMMISSION	
2		
3	PUBLIC MEETING	
4	IN THE MATTER OF	
5	THE PROPOSED CONVERSION OF PREMERA BLUE CROSS	
6	TO A FOR-PROFIT CORPORATION	
7		
8	September 30, 2002	
9	at	
10	Best Western Executive Inn	
11	200 Taylor Avenue North	
12	Seattle, Washington	
13		
14		
15		
16	Taken Before:	
17	SUE E. GARCIA, CCR, RPR	
	Certified Court Reporter	
18	of	
	CAPITOL PACIFIC REPORTING	
19	2401 Bristol Court S.W.	
	Olympia, WA 98502	
20	360.352.2054	
	e-mail: capitolpacific@atg.com	
21	www.capitolpacificreporter.com	
22		
23		
24		
25		

## Premera Blue Cross Public Meeting

		Page 2
1	I N D E X	
2		PAGE
3	Mike Kreidler - Insurance Commissioner	3,75
4	Christine Gregoire - Attorney General	4
5	Jim Odiorne - Assistant Insurance Commissioner	6
6	Rusty Fallis - Assistant Attorney General	8
7	Gubby Barlow - CEO Premera Blue Cross	14
8	Yori Milo - Premera Blue Cross Executive VP	20
9		
10	Public Comment	
11	Mr. Len Eddinger	27
	Ms. Barbara Flye	30
12	Ms. Ele Hamburger	34
	Ms. Jean Roberts	38
13	Mr. Neal Koseff	41
	Ms. Kallijah Paraska	45
14	Ms. Ellie Menzies	50
	Ms. Sarajane Seigfriedt	52
15	Mr. Gordon Kinney	56
	Ms. Aretha Reed	57
16	Ms. Ruth Matthews	58
	Mr. Don Brunell	60
17	Mr. Jeff Mero	63
	Mr. Randy Revelle	66
18	Ms. Janet Varon	69
	Dr. Robert Crittenden	70
19	Dr. Gary Kaplan	72
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

Page 3 1 PROCEEDINGS (Monday, September 30, 2002, 6:04 p.m.) 3 4 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Good evening. I'm Mike 5 Kreidler, Washington State Insurance Commissioner. And joining us this evening are Attorney General Christine 6 7 Gregoire, also Assistant Attorney General Rusty Fallis, 8 and Deputy Insurance Commissioner Jim Odiorne. very much for coming tonight and participating in this forum. 10 11 On May 30 of this year Premera Blue Cross notified 12 me of their intent to convert from a nonprofit to a forprofit corporation. I ultimately will have to act as 13 14 judge and decide the impact of this application, if 15 approved, would have on consumers. 16 However, tonight we will be talking about the merits 17 of the proposed conversion. Our primary concerns, from 18 the standpoint of the Insurance Commissioner's Office 19 with this application are going to be that consumers are not harmed in conversion, the potential effect on 20 Premera's solvency, obtaining an accurate valuation of 21 Premera's assets. 22 23 The Attorney General Gregoire is charged with 24 overseeing the lawful distribution of the value of 25 Premera's assets. I would like to turn to the Attorney

Page 4

General for some opening comments.

MS. GREGOIRE: Thank you, Commissioner, and thank you for coming out for this public meeting this evening. We will do everything we can not only to take your comments this evening, but as this process moves forward.

I'm going to later turn the program over to Rusty
Fallis to go specifically into the role of the Attorney
General's Office with regard to this matter, but let me
at the outset briefly state that our role is one to look
at the antitrust implications of any potential
conversion, and at the time of the formal hearing, to
communicate any concerns that we have with regard to
antitrust to the Commissioner in the process of his
making his ultimate decision.

Furthermore, under the Charitable Solicitation Act and other statutory authority in Washington state, it's the role of the Attorney General to approve -- if the Commissioner finds that the conversion is approved -- to approve and authorize the distribution of any funds for a charitable purpose consistent with that of the nonprofit organization, in this instance Premera. So at that point in which the AG has to make any decision if, in fact, we do, we will be consulting not only with the Commissioner but with the public as well, as we proceed along that line. But all of that at this point is premature.

Page 5

We're anticipating four of these meetings throughout the state. I look forward to participating with you, Commissioner, and to hearing from the public any concerns or issues that you want to us to look at more in depth and follow up more in depth to ensure that consumers have the nonprofit kind of availability of coverage they do today, and this would not jeopardize, interrupt, or compromise that ability to get that coverage or to have a competitive marketplace for consumers in their healthcare.

So, again, thank you, Commissioner. I look forward to working you.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you, very much.

I would like to run over the evening's agenda just very briefly here.

First, it is critical that we hear from the public very early in the review process. This is clearly why we are here this evening. We will keep our presentations to a minimum.

We will begin with a ten-minute presentation by
Deputy Insurance Commissioner Jim Odiorne. Following
Jim, we will hear from Assistant Attorney General Rusty
Fallis, who will speak for ten minutes, and then Premera
Blue Cross will have 15 minutes to describe the
conversion proposal, and then we're going to open it up

**Public Meeting** Page 6 1 to the public. Jim? Thank you, Commissioner. Good evening 3 MR. ODIORNE: 4 and welcome. 5 We appreciate your attendance at this, our first public forum on the request by Premera to convert to a 6 7 for-profit entity. As the Commissioner indicated, 8 Premera has filed what we commonly know as a "Form A." Form A is required whenever as much as 10 percent of a 10 company transfers ownership. 11 On average, we receive two or three Form A 12 applications each year. This is the largest one we've had in a long time. This one is a very complex 13 14 transaction. There will be a number of companies that 15 have to be converted, formed, and other filings required 16 under the holding company. All of those changes are 17 wrapped into one filing this time, but each has to be analyzed individually and as it affects the whole 18 19 transaction. Included in that is the formation of new companies, intercompany agreements between all the 20 21 companies in the holding company system. Commissioner's authority is primarily in the Holding 22

requires a formal hearing before a final decision is

Company Act for Health Carriers, which is found in

Chapter 48.31C. Under this act, the Form A transaction

23

24

25

Page 7

made. In that hearing, the Commissioner will be acting as the judge, and for that reason, it's necessary to limit certain access to him during this process.

In that process of walling off, we have set aside certain people to assist the Commissioner, and the rest of the staff will serve as the OIC review team. Team will ultimately make a recommendation to the Commissioner at the time of the formal hearing.

We have retained a number of experts to assist in the analysis of this proposed transaction. We've retained experts in the areas of investment banking, actuarial analysis, accounting and tax matters, and legal services. The apparent successful bidders in those areas have prior experience in several other states where conversions are either currently or have been processed.

Review team will work very closely with those consultants in the development of our recommendation to the Commissioner. The experts have been requested and by contract will provide an executive summary of their filings, and those we will make available to the public, as soon as we can get them on the Net, anyway.

At one point we issued a preliminary time line that suggested that we would complete this process in December of 2002. We're going to take as long as necessary to be sure the filing is complete and we have the information

Page 8

from the consultants. So 2002 was a goal to shoot at, but not set in stone. It will move.

Our intention is that as much information as is legally possible will be made available to the public as soon as we can. For instance, it's my understanding now that there will be prefiled testimony in the final hearing and that formal process. And we will post that information on the Web site as soon as we can. Visiting our Web site should give you a sense of how our review process is coming along. We hope to keep it updated as often as we can.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you, Jim.

Assistant Attorney General Fallis.

MR. FALLIS: The Attorney General's office has three distinct roles to play in reviewing the proposed conversion. The first role is as legal advisor to the Office of the Insurance Commissioner. As is the case with other state agencies, the Commissioner's office receives legal counsel and litigation support services from the Attorney General's office.

In the proposed conversion, we will have a lawyer or lawyers available to provide legal advice to

Commissioner Kreidler with respect to his final decision on those matters that are subject to his statutory

Page 9

authority.

We will have a separate lawyer or lawyers available to advise the commission staff in its development of its case or recommendation to Commissioner Kreidler in the adjudicative hearing.

This bifurcation or segregation of legal advice reflects the requirement in the Administrative Procedure Act that the final decision-maker in an adjudicative hearing be insulated from people that have a stake in the outcome of the hearing. This applies not only to the agency's staff members but to their lawyers as well. It's similar to the judicial concept that parties to litigation and their lawyers not have private access to the jury.

The idea is that the ultimate decision-maker is to be objective and that the parties to the hearing -- that no party to the hearing have an unfair advantage. So we have structured our staff functions in a way that adheres to the requirement in the APA that those persons -- lawyers and nonlawyers -- who take an advocacy position in the adjudicative hearing not have inappropriate access to the final decision-maker.

The second role that the Attorney General's office will play will be to review possible antitrust issues and other anticompetitive -- potential anticompetitive

Page 10

effects of the proposed conversion. The Insurance
Holding Company Act specifically provides that the
Attorney General's office and the Insurance
Commissioner's office confer on these issues, and these
agencies will confer on those.

There is a separate team of lawyers in the Attorney General's office who handle antitrust issues, and they will review them and analyze them, and as they deem appropriate, make their concerns or lack of concerns, as the case may be, known to the Commissioner's staff.

Depending on what those lawyers find, they may or may not choose to seek to intervene as a party in the adjudicative hearing that the Commissioner will be holding. That's ultimately their decision, not mine.

But I mention it because it's at least theoretically possible that their review of the antitrust issues may, in part, take the form of participating as advocates in the adjudicative hearing.

The third role that the Attorney General's office will play in the review of the proposed conversion is to review the plan of distribution of assets. The Washington Nonprofit Corporation Act provides in part that, where there is a proposal to dissolve a nonprofit corporation and the assets of that corporation are required by law to be used only for charitable or other

similar public benefit purposes, then the Attorney

General must approve the disposition of those assets.

The common law authority to administer charitable trusts provides similar authority to the Attorney General. Nonprofit Corporation Act goes on to say that, where there is such a corporation which is proposed for dissolution, the assets are to be transferred to a similar organization, meaning a private, nonprofit organization with a similar purpose. And the review of the Attorney General, therefore, involves a quantitative and a qualitative analysis.

In practical terms, our review will involve two major areas of inquiry. One is looking at the valuation of the assets to make sure that the size or the amount of endowment is appropriate. In this connection, our decision, I expect, will be informed to an important degree by the analysis of the investment banking firm and the other technical experts that the Commissioner's office will engage to help us in this analysis.

There will be subsidiary issues, I expect, such as the timing and the structure of the sale of stock, which is proposed to be transferred to the charitable organization. These other kinds of issues could affect the value of the stock and, therefore, the size of the endowment. But, again, they relate to the first

principal area of inquiry, which is the valuation of the assets for the size for the endowment.

Second primary area of inquiry will be to look at the nature and structure of the charitable organization which is proposed to be created. Again, the Nonprofit Corporation Act and the common law of charitable trusts provides that the assets of an entity that is to be dissolved are to be transferred to a similar organization which can carry on a purpose or purposes similar to those carried out by the organization that's been dissolved. So, for example, the mission statement of the charitable organization that is to be created will be an important element of whether this organization can carry on the appropriate purposes.

We will also look at the articles of incorporation and bylaws because those, as well, in practical terms will have an important effect on whether that charitable or public benefit purpose can be carried out. Again, there will be subsidiary issues that we will look at, things relating to whether there is any relationship or proposed relationship between the charitable organization and the new for-profit companies. The charitable organization has to be independent, again, so that it can carry out the charitable or public-benefit purposes.

One device or approach that's been used in some

Page 13

other states that have been faced with conversions is the appointment of a citizen's advisory committee, and that's something that we're considering doing this instance.

This is a committee that could assist our office in, for instance, developing an appropriate mission statement, developing articles and bylaws for the new organization, and possibly identifying potential board members.

In summary, those are the three primary functions that our office will play. As Attorney General Gregoire mentioned, there are going to be further public forums and meetings, and we certainly invite people to participate in those.

But if you would rather convey your concerns in a more private or more informal manner, I certainly invite you to call me or e-mail me. I will be available after the meeting tonight and can give you my phone number and other information so that you can call me or send me a letter or whatever you'd like to if you have information or concerns that you think my office should consider in performing its role in these reviews.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you, Rusty. We now have an opportunity for public comment, and I would like to just kind of outline some of rules here for that comment.

First, I'm going to call your name, and I would like to have you, obviously, come up and take a seat right here... (Pause.) Oh, thanks for reminding me. There is another presentation.

Before we get to public comment, let me move to hear from Premera since they did have 15 minutes -- didn't they? -- and it is their filing that we have before us. Like to call on Premera's Gubby Barlow.

MR. BARLOW: I think we got a buzz on this. Maybe it's this. I don't think this is going to work.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Is there some way to turn these off so we don't get feedback off these other mikes?

MR. BARLOW: Well, if we turn off these other ones, won't that help?

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: They're working. See if they can solve that. I think they may have done that.

MR. BARLOW: Well, thank you very much, Commissioner Kreidler, Attorney General Gregoire, Commissioner Odiorne, and Assistant Attorney General Fallis. Please excuse my back. It's rather awkwardly situated here tonight, so if you will indulge me so that I can face the audience here.

Well, thank you all for being here tonight and for showing your interest in our proposal to raise capital as a public company.

Page 15

Before I begin, in case any of you are here with customer service needs, we do have someone who can assist. We have Laurie Scott, who is our director of customer service -- Laurie, could you stand, please -- to answer any questions that you may have.

Well, as it's been pointed out, it is four months since we announced our proposal to convert to for-profit in the spring. Since then, many people have come forward with words of support and certainly with many questions about what we are doing. People are asking, Why is Premera proposing to convert? Will a conversion result in a focus on Wall Street instead of our customers? Will premiums rise as a result of this conversion? Or will we squeeze payments to physicians, hospitals, and other providers?

And questions about success bonuses payable to management. Will there be any? Does Premera want to be taken over by another large out-of-state insurer? And if not, how is Premera going to prevent that happening?

There's also a great deal of interest in our proposal to fund health initiatives in the states of Washington and Alaska by dedicating 100 percent of the initial stock of the company to that purpose. People are asking, How will it be determined how that money is spent? And who will control the resulting charities that

Page 16

we are proposing?

These are, of course, important questions and deserve to be discussed fully with the public. I'm confident that we can provide very good answers to all of these questions. More importantly, I know that our proposal will not be approved unless we have addressed every one of these questions to the satisfaction of our state's officials.

So to begin, Premera Blue Cross is a Washington state corporation, nonprofit. We are the largest private company, at last count, in the State of Washington with 3,000 employees. We serve 1500 people in three states. We have our roots in Washington where we started. One of our predecessors was started in 1933. We started up in Alaska in 1957, and we bought an Oregon-based company in 1994. And we have just announced that we are starting an affiliate in Arizona.

So why does this company exist at all? I believe that people buy health insurance for one reason: To obtain peace of mind. And that is what the mission of our company is about: Providing peace of mind to our members about their healthcare coverage.

Now, for us, delivering on that mission means several things. Firstly, it means being financially stable. It means providing broad choices of products,

Page 17

physicians, hospitals, other providers. It means that the company provides excellent service, and it means that we support growth.

Growth not only responds to the needs of new customers, but it also helps existing customers in that we can spread the cost of our investments and our general administrative costs over a broader base to the benefit of all.

And because all healthcare is local, we believe that the best way to serve our members is being a locally based, locally managed company. That has been our strategy as a nonprofit. That would be our strategy as a for-profit.

So why, then, does Premera want to convert? Because going public, simply stated, gives us access to capital to better accomplish our mission. We float in a capital-intensive world in healthcare. We need capital for several reasons: First, to maintain our insurance reserves; second, to invest in new technologies, new products; and third, to serve more customers.

As a nonprofit, our source of capital is very limited. It's basically based upon our operating profits, and that is a very slim margin. 19 -- I'm sorry, in 2001, our operating profit was a slim 1 cent on the healthcare dollar.

Now, you should know that we have explored other sources of capital but have rejected that. For example, we've considered mergers as one of the large Washington-based nonprofits has considered a merger with a very large Illinois company. We've rejected that form of capital because it would mean that we would lose our independence and that goal of being an independently managed company based here in Washington.

So let's turn to the concerns that I've heard about this conversion, as to the effects on -- of Wall Street on the company. Now, I've said this many times. I'm sure you've read it in the newspaper, but I'll repeat it for the record here. The company that focuses on its stockholders first and its customers and other stakeholders second is doomed to fail on both fronts. Our mission and dedication to our members remains the same whether we are for-profit or nonprofit.

Secondly, conversion will not affect the amount that we charge our customers or the amount that we pay physicians and other providers. Today we serve in a very competitive healthcare marketplace, competing with for-profits and nonprofits alike. We charge our customers the market price, and we pay doctors and hospitals what the market demands. Clearly, market forces are independent of and unaffected by our capital

1 structure.

Third, some conversions have led to significant bonuses, success bonuses paid to management upon completion of the merger. In the case of Premera's conversion, there will be no bonus paid for the successful completion of this transaction.

We have -- we have not, at this stage, a proposal for any stock-based compensation either. Not to say that there will not be, but these will be looked at by our board, which is comprised of well-respected independent members of the community, physicians, and other business leaders. And if they do approve any stock plans, those, of course, would be submitted as part of our filings to be approved by our state officials.

The fourth and most often-asked question is: Does the company plan to sell itself? The answer is a simple no. We have repeatedly said, and even in today's presentation, that we plan to remain an independent, locally managed company. Our board has determined this to be so. We fully intend to include in our filings all of the antitakeover provisions that are available to us under Washington state law.

There's also another very important point to be made, that after conversion, even if the company were to consider selling itself, such a transaction would be

subject to examination by the Commissioner and other state officials just in the same way as a conversion.

And we know that this would not be approved without such approval -- it would not occur without such approval.

So to sum up, I believe that a conversion has three wonderful wins for the State of Washington. First, for our members, in that the company would have the capital to serve our members better. Secondly, for our state, in that a local company will be growing, providing additional jobs, and supporting our tax base. And finally, for the people of Washington and Alaska, a very essential pool of funds will be dedicated to health initiatives in these two states.

Thank you. I now ask Yori Milo, one of our executives, to add some more detail to our proposal.

MR. MILO: Well, Gubby spoke about the reasons we want to change our corporate form to a stock company; that is to access capital. I'm going to be talking a little bit more specifically about what we're proposing to do, how we propose to reorganize as a stock company, and also talk a little bit about our charitable organizations that would carry out the mission and the legacy of the foundation that would be created out of the conversion.

So when we talk about "conversion," maybe a good

Page 21

starting point is to think about what that term really means. And what we'd like to do is talk a little bit about the current Premera family of companies, how they're organized, and how after a conversion it would be reorganized and what it would look like in that context.

So with that, I would like to flash on the screen, if I could. This is a chart that shows the current structure of the Premera family of companies, and as you can see, the green companies are the nonprofit companies in our organization.

Can't tell what that color is. Is that red? Blue. The blue designates companies that are for-profit today. So as you can see, today we're a mix of for-profit companies and nonprofit companies. For example -- let's see if this thing works. Not too well. Nope. Premera Blue Cross. Premera Blue Cross is our main operating company. It is a non-profit company. It has been so since its inception, and it offers healthcare coverage policies in both Washington and Alaska.

By contrast, Lifewise of Oregon, down there at the bottom right in blue, also sells health insurance coverage in Oregon. It is a for-profit company. It has been a for-profit since it joined the Premera group of companies, and it was a for-profit when it was initially organized.

Which actually leads to a question: So what is the difference between a for-profit and a nonprofit company? Well, a key difference is that a for-profit company has shareholders, and stockholders get their stock by buying it, by paying to the company money which then goes to support the capital and operating needs of the company.

Nonprofit companies don't have stockholders. And if you look at Premera, the upper tier company in our family of companies, there are no shareholders, which means that we must raise capital solely by our -- the profits from our operations. And what we're looking to do is to create a stock-based company that can sell stock and generate capital for our operations and reserves.

While there are differences between for-profits and nonprofits like Premera as we are currently organized, there are also misperceptions about similarities between nonprofits and for-profits. Premera Blue Cross is not a tax-exempt charitable organization. It pays taxes both on a state level and a federal level. In 2001 it paid over \$37 million to the State of Washington, the same amount it would have paid had it been operating as a for-profit company during this period, and it also paid federal taxes. It paid over \$10 million in federal taxes to the government in 2001.

For-profits and nonprofit insurance companies are

also regulated in the same manner under the auspices of the Office of Insurance Commissioner, under the same rules and regulations which apply equally to for-profits and nonprofits. So in summary, although there are similarities between for-profits and nonprofits, the main distinction is the ability to have shareholders and the ability to raise capital.

What I would like to do now is move to what it would look like after a reorganization consistent with the documents we've filed with the Office of the Insurance Commissioner. This is our proposed structure, and you'll see -- this thing doesn't work well -- these companies in blue down here are the same family of companies that you saw in the prior chart but now reorganized in for-profit form. And that reorganization would be through a series of transactions that are described in the materials that we've filed with the Office of Insurance Commissioner and, I believe, are actually now on the Web site as well for your review. Those are the transactions that need to be reviewed by the Office of the Insurance Commissioner as well as by the Attorney General.

The organizations that you see at the top of the chart in green are the new charitable organizations, and I'd like to spend a minute talking about them. Gubby had mentioned that we are proposing to dedicate 100 percent

of the initial stock on conversion to support charitable initiatives. That would be done by transferring 100 percent of the stock of New Premera to the foundation shareholder, a charitable organization, which has two purposes: to hold and sell the stock, and then, to distribute the proceeds so that those proceeds are used for charitable purposes.

Those charitable purposes would be carried out by two new charitable organizations, one for Alaska and one for Washington, that would receive the proceeds of that stock in allocations agreed to by the states of Washington and Alaska as part of the conversion approval.

People have asked about the independence of these charitable organizations. I know that Rusty had said that was a concern that would be reviewed as part of the review process. As part of our proposal, we propose no interrelationship between Premera, the Premera company, and its charities. The charities would have an entirely independent boards, there would be no representation of Premera or its representatives, no control over their operations.

We also know that there is a lot of interest in what the charities would do, what their purposes would be.

And as part of our planning, we have some ideas about what we think would be good things to do: To help

address unmet healthcare needs of underserved populations in our state; education of physicians, nurses, and caregivers who are committed to serve in underserved areas; and in general, to form a legacy endowment to support health initiatives throughout our community.

But we also recognize state officials and the community have an interest in what this charity would do. As part of our filing, we acknowledge that and invite the Office of the Insurance Commission and Attorney General to help get community input on what the charter document should provide.

Now, we've talked about the charitable organizations. As Gubby said, the purpose we're looking to convert is to raise capital for the company so that it can fund its operations and reserves. The way the company would do that is by New Premera issuing new shares, selling those shares in the public market, that is the stock markets, the proceeds of which would go to fund company operations.

In conclusion, we've taken a look at all the conversions that have taken place over the last decade in the US and tried to learn the lessons from those conversions, to understand the concerns of other stakeholders in the community, and try to address those concerns in the way we've structured our proposal.

We know you have a lot of questions and concerns.

We know those need to be considered as part of the conversion approval process. We want to hear those issues as well. We thank you for coming, and thank you, Attorney General Gregoire and Insurance Commissioner Kreidler, for letting us present.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: As I started to say, my scripture ran right from Assistant Attorney to public comment. That was my undoing, and I apologize for not calling on Premera immediately.

Let me say that, as part of the details for commenting tonight, when I call your name, obviously, I want you to come up here to have a seat. There's an additional seat up here. I would like to call on the person who will be next up so that they will have an opportunity to speak.

I would like to -- it appears right now that we can do -- three minutes? -- three minutes apiece for testimony. And the principal reason for holding it to a strict time limit is to make sure that everybody who has signed up has an opportunity to comment. As you can see, we are transcribing this entire forum to make sure that we have an accurate record of this evening's proceedings.

If you have written comment, I would urge you to summarize your comments. If indeed it's necessary in

order to remain within the time limit, your written comments may be submitted to our timekeeper who will raise her hand over here, Diane Prigge, and she will be able to take any prepared comments that you want to formally submit. When you come forward, I would ask you to state your name clearly, make your comments directly into the mike so that the written record is precise.

I would also like to point out that we've designed these forums for the express purposes of taking comments early in the process here of reviewing Premera's requested proposal. We will have further opportunities for public comment later. This is the preliminary. We anticipate that there would be another round of public forums that would afford people the opportunity to speak when we have additional information.

Let me point out that we are not prepared tonight to answer questions or engage in rebuttals or debate. We have many questions ourselves. Your questions will be included in the record and will be certainly considered as a part of the overall review process.

That said, I would like to now begin by calling the individuals. First up, call on Len Eddinger. Sir, would you come forward, and then, also, the next person up, Barbara Flye.

MR. EDDINGER: Good evening, Commissioner Kreidler,

Page 28 Attorney General Gregoire, members of staff, I'm Len 1 Eddinger, director of public policy for the Washington State Medical Association, and I work --3 4 MADAM REPORTER: Sir, sir, I need you to ask you to 5 slow down your speech a little bit for me, please. MR. EDDINGER: Then I can't make it in three 6 7 minutes. 8 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Summarize. 9 MADAM REPORTER: Thank you. MR. EDDINGER: I'm Len Eddinger. I'm director of 10 11 public policy for the Washington State Medical 12 Association, and I work primarily in Olympia for the association. I am here on behalf of the 8,800 physicians 13 14 and surgeons in the state that belong to the association. And I'm here to testify in opposition to the 15 conversion of Premera from a not-for-profit to a 16 for-profit insurance company and ask you as regulators to 17 18 slow your process so that organizations like ours could 19 have more time to carefully review this particular proposal. 20 21 And at our recent annual meeting in Tacoma, our 22 house of delegates voted unanimously to oppose the Premera conversion. Our house of delegates is 23 24 comprised -- county and virtually -- medical specialty

society. Its members come from every type of setting,

25

academia to large groups to individual practices. And I offer this because it's significant that a resolution on such an important issue should pass without a dissent vote. Our leadership believes that it's been told in no uncertain terms that the proposed conversion is of serious concern to our members.

Let me summarize real quickly for you, Commissioner Kreidler and Attorney General Gregoire, and I'll submit this to writing some of the specific concerns that we have.

In areas of Washington State where Premera is functionally a single payer, such as in Eastern

Washington, what impact will this conversion have on the market and the physician and hospital networks? Our members feel it would be negative, and they can expect reduced fees for their services, or worse yet, that the company, again needing to satisfy its new stockholders, will leave the market where it cannot realize a sufficient return on investment.

What exactly is the thinking of management on why it needs to convert to for-profit? Exactly how threatened is the plan? To what use will the newfound capital be put? The experience nationally seems to be that capital raised through such conversions has been used to acquire other plans. We -- the representatives from Premera

talked about the concern that we have relative to: Are they positioning themselves to become an acquisition target for larger national organizations?

We're concerned that the management of the company in this new environment will be concerned about growing the company to make it a more attractive acquisition target rather than attending to the needs of subscribers or its network in our state.

To both of you, I will stop here and put, again, my testimony in writing and submit it for your record. I am trying to stay within the three minutes.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you, Mr. Eddinger.

MR. EDDINGER: Thank you.

1

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Barbara Flye, and following Barbara Flye, if Ele Hamburger would come up.

MS. FLYE: Commissioner Kreidler, Attorney General Gregoire, thank you very much for the opportunity to speak today.

My name is Barbara Flye, and I'm executive director of Washington Citizen Action. The WCA is a community-based organization that has over 50,000 members across our state, and thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today.

MS. PRIGGE: A little slower, Barbara, please.

MS. FLYE: Premera's conversion raises many concerns

about the impact on Washingtonians' access to healthcare and the affordability of coverage. We know, for example, in the state of Kansas that conversion was denied by the insurance commissioner because they deemed that there was significant increases in rates to those consumers. And we also have considerable concerns about the impact on publicly funded healthcare programs in our state.

Premera covers 637,930 lives through Washington's publicly funded healthcare programs, and so we're concerned about their continued commitment to those programs as well, as well as the commitment on rates. And secondly, the future of the considerable nonprofit assets that it currently holds estimated to be worth as much as \$2.1 billion.

First and foremost, we believe that this should be a public process, and thank you for these first set of public hearings and the second set that you intend to do. And I want to encourage you to continue to make this a public process and involve stakeholders from around the state as you deliberate and look at the information that you were given by the consultants that you've attained.

Secondly, we believe that as part of that process, we believe it's very important to conduct a health impact evaluation to look at the impact of the proposed conversion on all of Washingtonians.

Thirdly -- and I can submit some comments too to sort of sum up a little bit -- coming back to the impact on subscribers of the health carrier and on the general public, just wanted to mention a few things we think would be important for you to consider as part that: The impact on premiums for current or future Premera enrollees, what is the expected rate of increase? Impact on premiums for current or future Premera enrollees given specific counties of the state where they may be the only company offering coverage; impact on Healthy Options and basic health given the current level; impact on physician and provider networks in the areas of the state where Premera is the dominant carrier; and the effect on the individual and small-group market.

Our concerns are not only around Premera enrollees and potential future Premera enrollees but what might be impacts if we have a domino effect, in effect, if Premera goes for-profit, if Regence decides they want to go for-profit, what might be the impacts on Group Health, for instance, in our state that's already struggling. So we have concerns in general about the insurance going public in our state as a result of this proposed conversion.

Additionally, we have concerns about the valuation and securities concerns that were raised with the

Page 33

proposed transaction. If the transaction is approved, we want to ensure that the full value of the corporation is taken into consideration; not just what it might get at a first offering on the stock market, but including things like the goodwill of the company, and that it was mentioned that the company's been around since 1933 in our state. We believe that that's worth a lot to the State of Washington, so we would hope that you would take that into consideration.

The private inurement issue was mentioned. We believe that that's really important for you to take a look at given what's happened in other states on that issue.

To close, overarching for Washington Citizen Action members is really the very first consideration, whether this conversion should be allowed to go through or not based on the potential impacts of the insurance-buying public. We think it's a very serious proposal that they put forward and believe that the impacts could be considerable given what we've seen around the country.

And given what we know, we want to make sure that you all consider as you're looking towards this and really encourage you, in addition to the other consultants that will look at the value and things like that, to really look at the health impacts that will

Page 34

result as a part of this conversion and take the time to
do that.

3 Thank you.

4 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much, Barbara 5 Flye.

Ele Hamburger, then following Ele, if Jean Roberts would come up.

MS. HAMBURGER: Good evening and thank you very much for the opportunity to testify here tonight. My name's Ele Hamburger. I'm an attorney with Columbia Legal Services, and I'm appearing on behalf of my client, the Welfare Rights Organizing Coalition, which is a statewide coalition of grass-roots -- statewide grass-roots organization of low income consumers, most of whom receive Medicaid services.

Our -- my clients are very concerned about what's going to happen to the involvement of Premera in the Medicaid program as a result of this change. The Premera presentation said that -- overly simplified the real differences between for-profit and nonprofit companies.

And one of the major difference that wasn't mentioned is the difference in mission. Premera has been a non-profit with a mission dedicated to the social welfare of this community. As a for-profit, that mission will disappear and instead will be replaced by a mission

required by law to increase profits for its owners and shareholders. And that mission could have very severe impact on the access to services for low income people who participate in the Healthy Options program and who really rely on Premera, especially in rural areas, to ensure access to their Medicaid coverage.

By way of background, before I move here to
Washington state six years ago, I worked at Consumer's
Union on the Blue Cross in California conversion and also
helped start the national project on Blue Cross of -Blue Cross conversions and worked on the conversions in
Ohio and Colorado and Missouri.

And early on in those transactions, insiders and top executives became overnight multimillionaires off of these types of transactions. The Blue Cross of California regulators started paying quite a lot of attention to both the health impacts of the transactions and what was happening to the money, what was the -- were the conversions being fully valued and who was making money off the transaction. And I'm very pleased to hear that those same questions and concerns are being considered as part of this review.

One of the things that deeply concerns us about the documents that have been filed so far, first of all,

Premera has made some of the documents available to us

but not all of the documents. And we're concerned that all of the documents be made publicly available. They are critically important for the public in order to evaluate whether this transaction is in the public interest.

It appears that there are some documents that are — would be very helpful to analyzing this transaction that have not been made public by Premera at this point.

Nothing in the documents that have been made available address this issue about what the health impact is of the transaction. Will Premera stay in the public programs?

Will they continue to serve in rural areas? Will they continue to serve in the Healthy Options program? That information has not been included nor is the information about stock options and other possible financial benefits.

And some transactions in other states, there are wide variety of mechanisms involved in which individuals can make profit off of these transactions, including severance packages that get triggered by the end of one corporation and the creation of another, when essentially they're simply changing -- staying in the same job as the corporation changes around them.

Another issue that deeply concerns us is to ensure the complete independence of the foundations that receive

the proceeds from the Premera transaction. In the presentation before, there was discussion about the charitable organizations but not the independence of this -- what Premera's describing as the "foundation shareholder."

In fact, it appears, based upon the documents that have been provided so far, that the foundation shareholder will be tightly controlled by the Premera board. It would not be able to vote the stock independently or sell the stock independently, and there will be restrictions that Premera proposes on how it gives the money out, essentially extending Premera's control to the charitable foundations as well.

The idea of a citizen's advisory committee on how those foundations would be constituted is very appealing, and my experience with it in California was very positive. But it needs to be for all of the organizations that receive the funding, including this foundation shareholder. The independence of the foundation shareholder is critically important.

To sum up what has been disclosed so far does not address our client's questions or concerns regarding whether the transaction is in the public interest. We urge that the full filing be made public and that the public be involved and have an opportunity to present its

- 1 concerns throughout every stage of this process.
- 2 And appreciate your giving us this opportunity 3 tonight. Thank you.

4 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much, Ele.

Let me point out that the initial filing that was submitted to our office is already posted on our Web site, and the additional supplement to that was filed, I believe, on Friday. It's about 500 pages that will also be added. So about 1500 pages associated directly with the filing will be available on our Web site. And I'll give that guote here before we're done.

And we now have Jean Roberts, and following Jean Roberts, we'll have Neal Koseff. Am I pronouncing correctly?

MR. KOSEFF: Yes, that's good enough.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Why don't you come up, too, and be on deck.

18 Jean?

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. ROBERTS: Thank you for the opportunity to come and share some of my thoughts. I am Jean Roberts. I'm the administrator at Mark Reed Hospital in McCleary, which is located between Aberdeen and Olympia.

The hospital has always been operated by Grays
Harbor County Public Hospital District No. 1. We're one
of the smallest hospitals in the state, licensed for 24

Page 39

beds. I'm currently president of the association of Washington Public Hospital Districts, and those districts represent about -- almost 50 hospital districts throughout the state, which play a significant role in providing healthcare to the State of Washington, particularly in rural areas.

At our Hospital District Association board retreat in August, the board voted to oppose the conversion of Premera to for-profit status. I've taken time to attend this meeting because I think it's important that we're able to continue to provide care in rural areas in Washington. I'm concerned about how the Premera conversion would affect rural areas.

I understand that after conversion in other states, the new for-profit plans have looked very closely at those areas where they were not profitable, and many of those, undoubtedly, were rural areas. And they have frequently discontinued plans in those areas. I'm concerned that this could very well happen in Washington in the rural areas, and I'm concerned about how that would affect small rural hospitals, physicians, clinics, and most of all, our patients that we serve.

I am concerned that there could eventually be fewer plans to choose from, and in rural areas there aren't many plans to choose from to begin with. I'm concerned

about Mark Reed Hospital and its ability to provide insurance for our employees, and we are all covered by Premera Blue Cross. We pay high premiums and cannot afford to pay even higher premiums or have less options for coverage. And I do -- I am concerned that with the for-profit status, those premiums would very likely go up.

I noticed on the handout this evening, one of the main concerns -- the primary concern was that consumers not be harmed, and I am concerned about that. I'm also concerned about the potential for the decreasing ability for hospitals to negotiate contracts for care.

Someone else mentioned Kansas. And I know -- I understand that in Kansas, which is a very rural state, the conversion and purchase by a company from outside of the state was denied. And as the other person said, because it was not in the best interest of the public. And I'm fearful that it may not be in the best interest in Washington.

If Premera converts and then is purchased by a health plan from outside Washington, the flow of money could very likely go out of the state, and I don't believe that Washington state can afford that.

In Massachusetts where Harvard Pilgrim HealthCare was in precarious financial condition in 2000, there was

Page 41 speculation that it would be acquired by a national 1 for-profit health insurer. And at that time Dr. Peter Levine, who was president at the University of 4 Massachusetts Memorial Medical Center, stated: 5 principal goal of these companies, by definition, is the financial success and happiness of their shareholders as 6 7 opposed to patient satisfaction and healthcare outcomes." 8 I think there are many hospitals and clinics in rural Washington which provide access to healthcare to those who choose to live in the rural areas of our state. 10 11 I believe that the conversion of Premera to a for-profit status would very likely have a negative effect on rural 12 hospitals and physicians and our patients. 13 14 Thank you. 15 MS. GREGOIRE: Thank you. 16 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much, Jean. 17 Neal Koseff. Maybe you can tell me how to pronounce 18 it. 19 MR. KOSEFF: Yeah, that's Koseff. Yeah, hi, my name is Neal Koseff, and I want to apologize. Everyone's here 20 21 with formal presentation and suits and ties. I just 22 found out about this today reading the newspaper, and 23 everybody represents formal groups. I just kind of 24 represent myself. I'm a customer. 25 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Could I just interrupt you

Page 42 for a second? I didn't call up the on-deck person. 1 might do so, I'm going to struggle on the first name, but the last name is Paraska? Want to come up? 4 Please excuse me for interrupting you. 5 MR. KOSEFF: That's fine. COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Also, if I might introduce 6 7 State Senator Pat Thibaudeau is also here. Thank you, 8 Pat, for coming to speak. MR. KOSEFF: As I mentioned, I don't have a formal presentation, so I'm just going to speak off the top of 10 11 my head. I live in the Green Lake area of Seattle. 12 55 years old and have been a, quote, customer, of Blue Cross Premera for the last 20 years, of which the last 12 13 14 has been continuous since 1989, but maybe over my lifetime over 20 years. 15 16 Let me say, they mentioned the word "customers," and 17 there's actually a couple different groups of customers. 18 I've broken it down into two groups: The blessed and the 19 The blessed customers are people like yourself, 20 state employees, where you're a large group and they give 21 you good deals, like Boeing employees likewise. And then there's the damned that are cursed like 22 23 myself who are members of the general public who have to 24 just pay whatever they tell me year after year, and we

have absolutely no representation by anybody. In fact, I

25

think we used to be about two or three hundred thousand, and now we are down to 50. That's how good the customers' relationships have been.

Every year I have to dread my health insurance going up. I mean, I'm 55. It's like Russian roulette. They just raised it 30 percent. It's the single largest thing I have to pay every month. It's even higher than my mortgage now. And I -- to be honest, I don't know all the subtleties of what they want to do, but I'm questioning why all of this. Okay? I'm very mistrustful of what they want to do. I think they're not out for the customers' best -- at least my best interests. Okay? Again, they have different groups of customers.

But admittedly, I do not know all the details. Let me also say that what I don't want to see happen is my rates to go up any higher. I read in a newspaper today, they were dangling millions of dollars for you guys, you know, for the State to use to spend if you go along with this. And then they keep talking about the, quote, charities.

I need charity now. I've gotten to the point where, you know, if they told me tomorrow I have to hand over my house, I would have to do that, even though I'm in good health. There aren't many choices for me, and I'm fearful of this.

Page 44

And all I can say in the last minute here is there's been in the last couple years a lot of conversion from public to private. Look what happened with energy deregulations. I'm sure Enron and all those companies down in California went down there and said, "Oh, we're going to do wonderful things. We're going to make it more competitive." The truth of the matter was totally opposite.

On top of that, all in the last year that is come out with the absolute incredible number of misrepresentations by corporations and lack of honesty, I would be afraid to turn this over to any private organization.

And, also, I would say to you to, please be a little bit better than your predecessor, Ms. Senn, I think her name was. Every time I would call her office, they would tell me, "Blue Cross is not allowed to raise your premiums."

And I would tell them, "They just raised them, and if I don't pay it they're going to cut me off."

And they said, "No, no, they can't raise it. We told them they can't do it."

So hopefully, your office will start to realize that another group of people out there who are unfortunate enough to foot the bill of the other charity case, but I

Page 45 1 have to foot the bill for charity cases and everybody And frankly, absolutely nobody cares about our That's why we have gone from hundreds of aroup. 4 thousands down to 50,000 with such great customer service 5 from Blue Cross. Thank you. 6 7 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much. 8 And I'd like to call on Ellie Menzies to come up for the on-deck position. And do I pronounce your name Kallijah? 10 11 MS. PARASKA: Kallijah. 12 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Kallijah? MS. PARASKA: Kallijah Paraska. 13 14 I'm senior vice president of a local brokerage firm. I've actually been on the employer's side. I was an 15 16 actual purchaser of healthcare for our corporation, and 17 I've had about 2500 employees. 18 And about 11 years ago, I converted to the 19 brokerage/consultant side. The primary reason I made 20 that conversion was because my broker would always come 21 in and give me 15 to 25 to 30 percent increases. I felt, 22 on a group of 2500 employees actuarially, I should be 23 able to spread the risk. And my broker couldn't explain 24 to me what it was that was causing the cost increase. 25 So when I went over to the broker side, the first

thing I noticed is that there's probably about 40 state laws that apply to group health insurance in this state, and each time a new state mandate -- or comes in and increases, that increases the cost to my employer group.

So as an example, when we had oral contraceptives, which came into effect on January 1, most of insurance companies came back and charged the consumer an average of 2 to 5 percent for that increase in the rates. But that's part of my job as a broker, to be able to explain that to them.

The things that my clients are most concerned about is they're concerned about access to physicians, which me being a consumer, I'm also concerned about access to physicians. I want to make sure the physicians get paid well. The primary reason for that is so that I can continue to have that access as well as my clients can.

The thing that we continue to see in the State of Washington is a movement of the physicians out of the State of Washington due to all the state mandates that we have, and they can't afford to operate in this state.

That being said, the other things that are going to be coming down the government side which I feel impact the insurance company's ability to continue profitabilitywise is HIPAA. HIPAA on average is going to cost about \$10 million a year to each insurance company

to protect the patients' privacy, which I think is a needed -- is a needed benefit.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But at the same token, if we are dealing with a nonprofit company, my concern is: Is that going to hit the bottom line of the consumers, and are those rate increases going to go up further if access to capital markets cannot be garnered? So I look at it on both Who's going to end up paying for the \$10 million per year for Premera Blue Cross to go to the HIPAA compliance, which will cost them \$30,000 in the end? a broker I know that if I can continue to go out and I continue to lose physicians outside of the State of Washington because there's no longer access because they're not being paid enough to be able to make a living, but at the same token if I'm delivering higher rate increases with less access, eventually I, as a broker, am going to be out of a job, and there's going to be people who can't see the physicians they want to see.

So I see it from both sides. I actually represent the majority of the medical clinics in the State of Washington, so I see the physician's side. I see the movement out of the State of Washington.

We also represent biotechs. I represent a city and a county in the State of Washington. They can't absorb the 50 and 60 percent increases anymore or the new state

Page 48

mandates that come down. I also represent manufacturing companies and airlines, so I have a pretty diverse book of business.

In total, I represent about 72 clients. Our company represents about 10,000 nationwide. I actually have business in 17 states, so I actually see it from 17 different states' sides. So I don't so much look at whether a company is a profit or a nonprofit. What I look at is: Do they have the capital reserves so that they can go ahead and continue to build the infrastructure that's needed every time a new state mandate comes down, and how does that impact my client's bottom line? Am I going to deliver a 15 percent rate increase this year or a 40?

So rate increases we're looking at this year are 15 to 20 percent. If I have to go out to a client now to deliver a 30 to 40 percent because of Premera Blue Cross having to deal with HIPAA privacy issues, the \$10 million a year, the E-commerce requirements that are required by both companies, I'm going to have a difficult time being able to limit those increases to my clients.

As well the things that are important to me are local management. I want to be able to make sure that, when my clients call and have a need, I have local management representation here, so I'm not calling a

Page 49

1 1-800 number in New Jersey. We have that quite a bit.

actually came into the business 11 years ago, we had 18 insurance companies in the State of Washington.

Therefore, it was more of a free-market economy. What we have today is we have one in receivership; we have four that have left the state; we have six that are no longer offering coverage or have moved out of the state due to state mandates. There's only five viable insurance companies left, and two of them are HMOs. At this point when I go out to the client and I lay out that I only have five viable options, they almost don't even want to see what the options are in this state.

The last comment I would like to make is, when I

So the point is, I think, outside the fact we need to be due diligent, going forward in what we're looking at, we also need to be concerned about where the money's going to come to continue to invest in the infrastructure, the moneys that are needed for the regulations that continue to incur in this state, including the HIPAA regulations.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much.

Ellie, and following Ellie Menzies, I would like to have Sarajane Siegfriedt come up and have a seat to be on deck.

MS. MENZIES: Good evening and thanks for the opportunity to be able to speak tonight. My name is Ellie Menzies, and I am here representing the Service Employees International Union, the Washington State Council.

SEIU represents 57,000 workers across Washington state. 30,000 of our members work in long-term care, including home care in nursing homes. 16,000 are acute care workers in hospitals, home health, and mental health, and that includes over 6,000 registered nurses. Over 10,000 are in the public sector, including state and school employees.

For many reasons, we are very concerned about the impact of Premera's proposed conversion for both consumers and workers as well as for the other nonprofit insurers, such as Group Health, in this state.

For instance, our newly organized independent provider home care workers depend primarily on public programs for their own healthcare, and in some parts of the state, the programs they and their clients depend on, like the BHP, Medicaid, and WSHIP, have contracts with the state that depend heavily on Premera for providing access to healthcare services. This is also true for our 6,000 members who are state employees. Premera covers almost 300,000 enrollees in the public employees benefits

board across the state.

We have not yet taken a position supporting or opposing this proposed conversion because we believe that many questions remain to be answered. And we look forward to working with you to ensure that the public's interest in this conversion is thoroughly analyzed. We are sure that before any conversion goes through, a thorough analysis needs to be done of the impact it will have on the cost of healthcare and access to coverage for consumers across Washington.

Our members serve the public and see the consequences of inadequate healthcare in our hospital emergency rooms, in our mental health system, and in the communities when our clients can't get access to needed healthcare. We also see the impact when the costs rise so that working families, both covered and not covered through their workplace, the recently unemployed, or the disabled can't afford the premiums either their premium's share is too high or through copays increasing.

We have seen that, in other states, more and more questions are being raised about whether or not it is in the public's interest to approve conversion. And we have seen serious questions about valuations that need to be examined before this should be approved. We believe the trust obligations the people of Washington need to be

Page 52 very thoroughly examined and the assets properly valued 1 if a conversion were to be approved. We look forward to a thorough analysis of Premera's 4 proposal on the healthcare needs -- excuse me -- a 5 thorough analysis on the impact of Premera's proposal on the healthcare needs of the people of this state. 6 7 Thank you very much. 8 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much. Sarajane Siegfriedt. And following her Gloria-Gordon Kinney, if she would 10 11 come up and take a seat, please. 12 MS. SEIGFRIEDT: I also wish to thank you for providing this public hearing at an early point in the 13 14 process. My name is Sarajane Siegfried. 15 representing only myself. I am an insured of Premera. I pay \$212 a month for 16 17 a so-so policy that was more affordable than the COBRA, which was totally unaffordable. 18 So the difference 19 between what I used to have and what I'm able to forward -- and I also am a citizen advocate. I consider 20 21 myself to be an informed consumer. 22 Based on that, I urge you not to approve this conversion. I do not believe it is in the public 23 24 interest. I believe that it will increase costs 25 inevitably, and it will lessen the availability of

Page 53

insurance because the profit line will be there. There will be stockholders. It is undeniable, and it is impossible for the mission to continue to be the same under those circumstances.

We do know that shareholder interests will be a concern for the management. We do know that the valuation of stock becomes a driver, and that quarterly reports become a driver, and that inevitably, there will be far shorter planning and outcome choice than it would be as a nonprofit. And if we know nothing about the stock market at this point, we've learned that the problem is that people are making decisions based on extremely short event, and that this simply doesn't work.

So based on that alone, I would urge you to deny this. If you do approve the conversion, I would urge you to place the fullest valuation an all of the assets including, you know, the fact that it is a going business with a huge subscriber list and so on.

I have a concern about the foundations that will be established and that those members be chosen not by Premera at all, but by some process that would probably include appointees by elected officials or elected bodies. It would be a true public representation. And they not be limited in how -- what they can do the stock and, you know, how what the mission is that that be not

determined at all by Premera.

If we were truly to invest this money in similar organizations, the only ones I can think of are Group Health or the part of the University of Washington that operates the hospital. I know that we've placed unbearable burdens on the University Medical Center in terms of continuing to fulfill its mission. In other words, we take away and close down chemical dependency treatment and then expect them to take all the of the people who are suffering into the emergency room. And this continues to worsen, and we need to pay attention to that function and make sure that it gets funded.

But the real function is for middle class people to continue to get insurance. We can think of a zillion public health uses for this foundation funding, but what about people just being able to access insurance, and that really is the only comparable thing, and that's my main concern.

I want to point out that Premera has injected for-profit companies into its current operation, particularly Magellan Behavioral Health Services, which now manages behavioral healthcare for 70 million, 80, 90 million people in the country. It's a for-profit company. It's inserted in the middle of this not-for-profit operation so that, obviously, they're

1 making a profit off of this.

They're making the profit off of the backs the behavioral healthcare providers and the chemical dependency providers, whom some of you know I used to represent. I no longer have that job because they can't afford to have an association, an office, or a lobbyist. That's closed down last spring, and I lost my job. That is the money that Magellan is taking that used to go to the providers. And this is not an acceptable situation. So we can see what happens when you put the for-profit into a not-for-profit situation.

Most of people in the state who think they have coverage for chemical dependency would be surprised to find out that when they got to the door that they would be declined. That's just a fact. So that really needs to be looked at as an example of what happens when we put a for-profit provider in the midst of that.

So I would challenge Premera to prove that this is truly in the public interest. I personally cannot see how it can be. And if we look at the condition of the stock market, perhaps this is an idea whose time has truly passed.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much.

Page 56

- 1 Am I correct in saying Gordon Kinney?
- 2 MR. KINNEY: You're correct.

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: And following Mr. Kinney, I would like to call on Roger Conner to take the next position here.

MR. KINNEY: Thank you and good evening all.

My wife and I are Plan J subscribers and have been since 1997. And we're very, very unhappy with the poor quality of service, particularly in the prescription rebate service. For the past four years, we have been fighting each month for rebates on time.

The biggest obstacle seems to be paid prescriptions from New Jersey or, in some cases, Lee's Summit,

Missouri. We go through the process of calling up and some excuse from the other end says we haven't done this; we haven't done that. We wait a period of three to eight weeks for the 50 percent rebate. And to say we have lost our patience is really short.

We would like to know who these people are back there paid prescriptions? What role do they play out here for Premera in the rebate process?

And lastly our concerns, if you are permitted to go public, will you provide better service than you have in the past, particularly with us?

Thank you.

	Page 57
1	COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much,
2	Mr. Kinney.
3	MS. GREGOIRE: Thank you.
4	COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Roger Conner. Maybe not
5	pronouncing it right. It's a little hard to read here.
6	Roger. Roger Conner.
7	Ms. Reed? Is there a Ms. Reed here, and I can't
8	pronounce the first name. I can't make it out here.
9	Ms. Reed? You've indicated to testify? Right here. Oh,
10	great.
11	Ms. Reed, if you would please come up, and then
12	following her would be Ruth Matthews. If Ruth would come
13	up and just be on deck, that would be great.
14	Ms. Reed?
15	MS. REED: Good evening and thank you for this
16	opportunity. I'm here representing myself.
17	MS. PRIGGE: Can you state your first and last name?
18	MS. REED: Aretha Reed.
19	MS. PRIGGE: Thank you.
20	MS. REED: I have some concerns about this proposal,
21	and simply for the fact that the cost of healthcare and
22	the mission of the current nonprofit company, I don't
23	think, has really lived up to its mission.
24	When you look back and there's been in the paper in
25	the '90s when your office, the insurance commissioner

said, and this wasn't the only company that didn't -that didn't buy what you said about raising rates on
individual coverage. They did it anyway.

It was in the paper about the salary of the then-president and CEO making as much as already a for-profit company. Even the latter part of 1986, besides a high salary, received a bonus of over \$100,000 for their performance going back to 1986 and '87. I see the current ads on TV during prime time. I see the name Premera at Safeco Field. I see money being spent for us in the public, money that's being spent in those ways that should be going to helping provide care for us as the public and helping keep our rates down.

I know earlier this year there was an article in The Times, too, questioning about the billing practices of the company. I would just ask this committee to really look into the company and make sure that they will fulfill whatever their mission is in this endeavor.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much.

And Ruth Matthews. And following her, I would like to call on Don Brunell, if you would come up and be on deck.

MS. MATTHEWS: I speak only for myself, and I'm the voice of naivetT and, I must say, cynicism and almost

Page 59

scepticism, particularly in what has happened to our country lately that has been disclosed.

I am a retired school teacher, and a great deal of my retirement funds do go to Premera Blue Cross for my J Program. And I was prepared to ask why this is being — the plan is being put forth, and I heard the answers to this this evening. And I was wondering before this I heard it was to enhance the corporate salaries about which we have witnessed of late. It certainly does not provide security to those of us who have supported. And I like to thing of us as members rather than the term I heard tonight frequently which was "customers."

I think it -- this plan, this change could be -- is harmful. I think I have questions about its ethical aspects and its morality. And it can be devastating to many of its members, particularly those who are seniors and those who are indigent and those in the middle class. And to use a current terminology, the move from nonprofit to profit is a preemptive move against affordable health coverage for those of us whom I've just mentioned.

Thank you very much.

1

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- 22 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you.
- 23 Don Brunell. And following Don Brunell, Jeff Mero.
- MR. BRUNELL: My name is Don Brunell.
- 25 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Go ahead.

Page 60

MR. BRUNELL: I'm president of the Association of Washington Business. And I would like to make it clear right off the bat, right from the start, that AWB has no position on the issue. And I also recognize that when I speak, I also speak for AWB, so they're inseparable.

I believe that one of the reasons that we have -and we have doctors, medical associations, hospital
associations, Premera, Regence, a number of other folks
who are members of our organization, and our organization
hasn't taken a position on this issue, nor has it
considered it.

I think the other point I wanted to make is that we are an association of employers who are very concerned about the limited ability to get health insurance today. I think what we would like to do is make sure that whatever we come out of in terms of this conversion is that we have an adequate market that is accessible and affordable.

We also -- we've been involved in the healthcare debate since I came to AWB in 1986, and one of the things we know is that the issue is only going to get more complicated as medical technology, as the aging population goes up, including -- we're going to -- we're -- we need to address these issues.

Our organization as of 1995 has its own health

Page 61

insurance plan that we offer to small businesses. We started out with an employer E-choice model in which we partnered with Premera, and we partnered with Regence. We also partnered with Group Health at the time and First Choice. That offered our members, our small business members from -- that employed 2 to 50 employees both a high, low, and HMO, high cost point of service, low cost point of service, and a HMO program. Each of the three carriers or four carriers offered that.

That plan was successful for about three or four years. Unfortunately, with the cost of health insurance and it just -- it really collapsed on itself.

Last, about three years ago we actually went out with an employer-choice model because healthcare costs were very, very important. And the costs of the insurance was important to our members. So we, after an RFP process, we did come to an agreement with Premera, and right now we have about 400 companies representing about 8,000 insured who are on this program, and that has four levels of insurance service.

And so we have had a growing program with Premera, and we have had a good experience. We had a good experience with Regence as well as Group Health and First Choice. I guess we're in the position -- we're taking a look at how this conversion and the information that's

Page 62

going to come out from the testimony and the hearings and the investigation these folks are doing to look at, number one, how it affects our members and, also, how it affects our little health plan.

The final thing I would say is that, in 1995 when the 1993 Health Law or Act failed, we met with Governor Lowery at the time in his office and made the commitment that, because there would no employer mandate to cover employees, that we would offer an insurance program to try and cover those folks who are not insured. And so that -- we've kept that commitment. And of the 400 companies that are offering insurance today through our plan, about 25 percent of those folks had never offered health insurance before.

So we're hopeful that, regardless of how the deliberations come out, that we can enhance those types of programs because we think that, as an employer, we want to offer health insurance. We want to offer our members health insurance so we can cover folks. It's just getting extremely difficult these days.

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you.

MS. GREGOIRE: Thank you.

24 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Jeff Mero. And following 25 Jeff Mero, Lee Van Divers, if they would come.

Page 63

MR. MERO: Good evening, my name is Jeff Mero. It's a pleasure and a privilege to appear before you tonight. I have a got written remarks that I'll leave with your transcribers here.

I'm the executive director of the Association of Public Hospital Districts in the State of Washington, and you heard earlier from my president, Jean Roberts, from McCleary.

I hope that not much of what I say contradicts much of what Jean brought. We are here, as Jean said, to oppose the proposed conversion of Blue Cross health plan from its status as a nonprofit corporation. We believe strongly that the conversion is not in the best interests of Washington citizens or its healthcare system.

We represent more than 50 local governments across the state, most of them located in the small rural communities. Our members by and large were created by and survive because they're sported by taxpayers who are concerned about local access to healthcare. From our perspective, for better or for worse, health insurance today is an integral part of the financing and delivering of the health services and medical care in the communities where our members operate.

In part, that integration comes because it's been a long time since pure medical insurance has been available

in the state. For the most part, what we're selling today is prepayment for services with pricing based on past experience. Financing and delivery are integrated in the mind of the consumer and in the experience of the provider.

We also believe that health services and medical care are on a short list of goods which, by their very nature, are not and cannot be treated as mere commodities. The quality of our life, our capacity to participate in social and economic activities, and often life itself is at stake in each serious encounter that we have with the medical care system. Our people depend on competent, caring response to whatever broken condition leads them to seek treatment.

We believe strongly that the public should not have to worry that their insurer or their medical care provider is motivated primarily by economic self-interest. We believe that the public expects all parts of the healthcare system to be professional in the original sense of that term, motivated primarily by the needs of those it serves. We believe much of the antipathy that the public feels towards healthcare providers to, including insurers, has the roots in the fact that too many of our people do not believe that the actions of their insurers or their caregivers are

Page 65

motivated by the needs of the people paying the bills.

We believe that a move to for-profit status by one of the state's largest health insurers, however well-intentioned the motivation, must inevitably and over time refocus that plan's management's primary accountability away from insured people and groups and toward shareholders. That focus, we believe, will create powerful incentives for a converted Premera to avoid vulnerable, hard-to-serve populations, undesirable geographic areas, and small rural communities.

Washington state -- you know this better than I
do -- Washington state has a long and solid history of
not-for-profit healthcare. For-profit insurers have
never been a significant part of the marketplace in
Washington; neither have for-profit hospitals. We are
fearful that this proposed conversion, should it occur,
will build strong momentum for a fundamental shift
towards for-profit medical care financing and delivery in
this state. We cannot imagine how a for-profit approach
to healthcare serves the best interests of the people in
our communities.

We look forward to working with you all and with others who share or interests in the organization of delivery of healthcare services in Washington. Thanks for letting me speak to you tonight.

Page 66 1 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you, Jack. Good to see you. I called for Lee, I was pronouncing it Van Divers. 4 Larry Jacobson? 5 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Larry had to leave. COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Randy Revelle? 6 7 following Randy Revelle, Janet Varon. I believe the name 8 is Janet, if you would come up and have a seat next to Mr. Revelle. MR. REVELLE: Good evening. I'm Randy Revelle, vice 10 11 president for policy and public affairs of the Washington 12 State Hospital Association. I'm also a former public official having served as King County executive and the 13 14 Seattle City Council. The Hospital Association now represents 97 hospitals 15 in the State of Washington, including all of the 16 17 community hospitals in the state. For our hospitals, 18 Premera is a major healthcare insurer in the region. 19 We're concerned that Premera's proposed conversion to a for-profit entity will have significant impacts on our 20 21 hospitals and the communities they serve. As others have said, we've not had sufficient time 22 23 to understand the many significant ramifications of this 24 proposal. At a minimum, we're very concerned about the

time line. The transaction is too big with too many

25

Page 67

potential issues to complete by the end of this year. It does not give us or others adequate time to evaluate the conversion, something none of us has faced before.

So if we don't have much information, why we are so concerned? We are concerned because we've contacted our counterparts in other states throughout the country where conversions have been proposed and have happened, and the news is alarming. The Maryland Hospital Association did an extensive review of the conversion proposal from their Blue Cross plan. The Association concluded that conversion to for-profit status was unnecessary and not in the public interest.

According to information that the Maryland association obtained and shared with us, conversions in other states have not had a positive impact on the public or providers. From a survey of other state hospital associations where conversions have happened, the Association found that none of the health plans improved their behavior in any area of public accountability, subscriber service, or provider relations.

In fact, in California, behavior worsened regarding responsiveness to state policy, level of payments to providers, and the handling of disputed cases or claims.

In Kansas, the insurance commissioner concluded a proposed conversion was not in the public interest

Page 68

because premiums would need to rise by at least 7 percent to meet the acquirer's profit goals. We certainly would not want to see this happen in Washington state.

Do we know whether the experiences of other states can be replicated here? No, we do not. We do know that many of rural hospitals are worried that Premera, often the only insurer in rural communities, will decide it is no longer good business, profitable business to be in rural areas.

We know many of our urban members are worried

Premera will cut its payments to them in order to

increase its profit margin. We are concerned the need to

make a profit will cause Premera to withdraw from certain

areas of the state and ultimately lead to fewer people in

the state with health insurance.

Despite the Office of the Insurance Commissioner hiring many experts to help with the analysis, we don't believe we can adequately get the answers to all our questions in the next few months. There's certainly too much for us to risk if this proposal is allowed to proceed at such a fast pace.

Based on what we know now, we ask the Insurance

Commissioner and the Attorney General to reject the

Premera conversion proposal on the grounds that it is

hazardous to the insurance-buying public. We don't think

Page 69 there's anything we will be told in the next three or 1 four months that will change our position. Thank you very much for the opportunity to testify. 4 I've given you longer comments in writing and will be 5 happy to participate in the process. COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much, Randy. 6 7 MS. GREGOIRE: Thank you, Randy. 8 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Janet Varon. Janet Varon. And following Janet, we'll have Bob Crittenden. Bob come up and be on deck, please. 10 11 Thank you. My name is Janet Varon, MS. VARON: 12 executive director of Northwest Health Law Advocates; I'm an attorney. I'm here representing the Medical 13 14 Assistance Advisory Committee, also known as the Title 19 15 Advisory Committee. It's an advisory group made up of 16 consumer representatives, a variety of healthcare 17 providers, health plans, and public health I am a consumer advocate. 18 representatives. 19 I would like to read to you tonight a resolution passed by the committee after a presentation from the 20 21 deputy insurance commissioner at our meeting last Friday. 22 "Resolve that the proposed Premera conversion should not be approved without adequate review and public input 23 24 regarding the potential positive and negative impact on 25 participation in publicly funded healthcare programs,

access to providers for DSHS or basic health clients or quality of care for these clients."

Factors to consider that may affect the impact on public programs include: Potential sale or transfer of public lines of business, which may change client choice among health plans; changed commitment to participation in public programs; changed commitment to community improvement projects that may not directly benefit the carrier's own enrollees; changed commitment to the bottom line may affect the quality of care, rates paid to providers. The precedential nature if the State approves one conversion: This may lead to other conversions of other health carriers. And the question of how endowment funds will be used.

So and in addition, my organization supports the other consumer groups' positions who spoke earlier.

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you.

Dr. Crittenden. And following Bob, we'll hear from Gary Kaplan.

Gary, if you would come up and be on deck.

DR. CRITTENDEN: Commissioner, Attorney General, my pleasure to be here tonight. My name is Bob Crittenden, past president of the Washington Academy of Family Physicians. I represent them tonight. This is a group

Page 71

of about 2500 family doctors in every -- actually every community in the state, and we're heavily represented in the rural communities as well as in the urban communities.

We are very concerned about this particular conversion for a lot of reasons. I think a lot of them we already mentioned. I won't try to repeat them all, but just from our view of it is that I don't think there's been a conversion where there hasn't been amalgamation or some sort of sale of the assets someplace. There's one, I think, in maybe it's Minnesota that really hasn't done that. But there's so few of them that have not changed ownership and changed their direction about who owns and what they're doing that I think we have to look very cautiously about what this means.

And I think people outlined a lot of questions that need to be asked tonight, and I know you will look into those. But I wanted to really ask hard -- want you to ask hard questions about that. Since most of -- a lot of our members are in rural areas, the comments about rural communities is -- we support those.

Many of the communities we are -- Premera is the only insurer, and a lot of those physicians are on the edge right now. I think financially -- they have very

Page 72

heavy Medicare and Medicaid populations. The removal or a substantial change in their market would really destabilize those communities. We would really think that we are going to have physicians who may or may not be able to stay in those communities. I think that's a great risk to them.

But anyway, the questions have been raised, and I think been raised by many of the people. My comment I want to make tonight is that, not only do we have to ask the first question -- is it right and is it good for the people in the state to convert? Are our patients, are our people in the communities going to really benefit -- but if we do that, then we have to look at the valuation and the independence of those funds and that they will be used for the public good.

And the most important thing, I really wanted to reiterate our support for you two in this process to really hopefully support you in making some hard decisions, because this will not be an easy process. And I want to encourage you to be as critical and as supportive of the people in the state as you can.

So thank you.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Gary?

DR. KAPLAN: Thank you. I'm Dr. Gary Kaplan. I'm the chairman and CEO of Virginia Mason Medical Center in

1 Seattle.

Virginia Mason has a long history with Premera Blue Cross. In fact, our relationship dates back to the mid-'40s when Premera was known as the Washington Hospital Service. Like our colleagues in healthcare, we have a lot of questions about the proposed conversion, but we are open-minded as we seek the answers with you to those questions.

Virginia Mason operated a health plan for a number of years, and that experience gave us unique perspective and insight into the challenges of the health plan business in today's environment. Premera Blue Cross is a company the Washington residents have come to count on for many years, and we're confident that, despite any change in status, with proper review and discussion, Premera will only continue to strengthen their high regard and consideration for their members.

However, as I mentioned, we do have some very basic questions. If the conversion does take place, we have two questions: What are the measures being taken to assure that the community is getting a fair and equitable valuation? And this had a been brought up by other speakers tonight. And secondly, what are the specific plans for the creation of a robust foundation to continue to give back to the community for health initiatives? I

think we need significant more specificity.

If market forces, for some unforeseen reason, weaken Premera's position as a for-profit company and they are acquired, the relationships in the community would undoubtedly see significant changes. And I think that's the fear of many here tonight. So we would like to know what the measures specifically that are being considered to prevent such a hostile takeover.

And in the event of an acquisition, what would that really mean for the residents in our state, for the employers in our community, and the physicians and hospitals in our region? We also wonder whether this move would put more pressure on other nonprofit entities, cascading, restructuring in the state's insurance industry. And that's also been brought up tonight.

Despite these questions, we're confident that

Premera can answer these and many more questions as the

process moves forward, and all the many constituencies

will have an opportunity to evaluate their proposal.

We've come to know Premera as a company of high integrity

that has demonstrated its commitment to being a

constructive member of the healthcare community. We know

the climate in healthcare is challenging at best. We're

all facing that; we all have to deal with that.

Amidst all this chaos, we think most important is

the corporate philosophy and the market approach to
consumers, to patients that truly matters, not whether
the company is for-profit or not-for-profit.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much,
Dr. Kaplan.

I've gone through the list of names of individuals who had indicated that they wished to speak tonight and offer comments or questions.

Is there anybody left blank and have changed their mind? I've learned this after a number of public meetings like this. If nobody raises their hand or indicates, I'm going to assume that there are none that would like to speak and didn't indicate so when they signed in.

We've done pretty well on our time tonight. Let me just say that this is the first of four forums that we are going to be holding around the state of Washington. We have another one on Wednesday in Spokane and follow-up ones that are going to take place in Vancouver and the Tri-Cities.

The transcriptions that take place from this forum, as they're transcribed, will be posted on our Web site.

We also want to make sure that after we've gathered more information -- certainly some of the questions and

comments that have been offered tonight have given us some insights into some of the things that we need to ask our experts about so that we have complete information -- we'll have another opportunity when that -- we do have further information for additional public comment and anticipate another series of forums like the four we are currently conducting around the state.

Let me urge you to check our Web site which is
Insurance Commissioner's Web site, which is
www.insurance.wa.gov. On that site there is an icon
which you can push that would take you to conversion, and
you'll have an opportunity there to see all of the
information that we're talking about here: A complete
filing, the transcript, all of the information that, as
we get it, we will be posting it there so it is available
to you and to the public at large.

Also, on our Web site there is a place where you can actually have direct contact with our office by virtue of e-mail. And that e-mail address, which is on that Web site, but also the specific Web site is conversion@oic.wa.gov.

I want to thank Attorney General Gregoire, her staff, and my staff for coming here tonight to help with this program. But most of all, I want to thank all of you for participating in this public process. It's an

## Premera Blue Cross Public Meeting

```
Page 77
           initial part of the process that we're involved in, but
 1
           it's invaluable, and I very much appreciate your
 3
           assistance.
                Thank you all for coming.
 4
                      (Proceedings concluded at 7:50 p.m.)
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

	Page 78
1	CERTIFICATE
2	I, SUE E. GARCIA, a duly authorized Court Reporter and
3	Notary Public in and for the State of Washington, residing at
4	Tacoma, do hereby certify:
5	That the foregoing proceedings were taken before me on
6	the 30th of September, 2002, and thereafter transcribed by me by
7	means of computer-aided transcription, that the transcript is a
8	full, true, and complete transcript of said proceedings;
9	That I am not a relative, employee, attorney, or
10	counsel of any party to this action or relative or employee of
11	any such attorney or counsel, and I am not financially
12	interested in the said action or the outcome thereof;
13	IN WITNESS HEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and
14	affixed my official seal this October 5, 2002.
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
	SUE E. GARCIA, CCR, RPR
25	GA-RC-IS-E305QB